



## PIPA Communication Team Meeting Notes

June 12, 2013

### Participants

(See participants list below.)

### Meeting Agenda / Objectives / Discussion Topics

See Julie's slides, attached.

### Discussion Notes

- Van McClendon, Pulaski County, AR, Planning & Development, joined discussion.
- Since last meeting, PIPA webinar for MA conducted. No further webinars scheduled at this time.
- Next meeting, face-to-face, August 6 & 7, Washington, DC
- FEMA invited to next meeting (Kathy Smith). FEMA provided feedback on primer.
- FEMA Mitigation Framework Leadership Group. DOT/PHMSA will participate. Meeting initially in July.
- Primer changes/comments – status update: Organizational restructure; Two primers vs one; Focus on Land Planning; distribution pipelines, acknowledge existing operator mitigation requirements
  - What additional information regarding same is desired/should be included? Request operator feedback.
  - Request public to comment on placement of what operators are already doing in front of document. (Anna Osland) Need to make sure local governments recognize that they do have responsibilities related to pipelines. (Van McClendon) Emergency managers are generally more up-to-date on existence and location of pipelines and what their responsibilities are.
- Another comment – watch use of “man-made hazard” when referring to pipelines. Need to add a paragraph to document that terrorism and other “man-made hazards” are threats to pipelines and reference TSA requirements/publications for onshore pipelines.
  - Rebecca Craven – revised language could be problematic; will wait to see revised document.
  - Van McClendon agrees with Rebecca. Need to watch about de-emphasizing that the pipeline is the hazard.
  - Larry Springer – issue is based on circumstances, and discussion needs to be clear.
  - Andrew Kohout said FERC referenced “other transportation modes” as indicative of hazard residing with products.
  - Carl Weimer – believes we all can get to the desired product. Careful review of language throughout will be needed. Focus on pipeline release instead of the materials released is likely best.
- Additional comments:
  - Add local gov't authority for new construction permitting
  - Preemption limits local authority. INGAA and PST to provide case studies.
  - Add benefits of collaboration between emergency management and planners. Help to explain what purpose of primer is. Anna and Van asked to provide paragraph/input regarding collaboration benefits. Anna noted there is variety in types and extent of collaboration. Van noted that experience in past showed a tremendous lack of collaboration among various emergency planning, land planning, and other local governmental agencies and pipeline operators.

- Photos – using more from PIPA webinars. More focus on land planner information needs. E.g., potential impacts and scope/size of impacts.
  - Comments: Need better annotated diagrams/photos to indicate what is being seen. Photos are important but need to send the right message. Need to define/discuss what terminology is being used.
  - Should indicate in all cases that development occurred around existing pipeline and that it is local government planning, zoning, etc., that is responsible to take pipeline risk into consideration before enabling development. Perhaps show year pipeline was installed and year development occurred. PIPA report gave examples of accommodating pipeline within development areas.
  - Most of photos are worst case and primer should acknowledge same. Should not “sprinkle” photos throughout document. Not all pipeline incidents are significant.
  - Don’t send message that property can’t be used, just that there is risk to be considered and mitigated. However, local governments can restrict development.
- Timeline for next revision of primer – end of June.
- Will there be something said at PAP meeting about primer? Van McClendon – land planning issues related to pipelines will be discussed but not necessarily PIPA initiative/primer.
- PHMSA has audited public awareness plans; will the results and recommendations from those audits be discussed? Any insights into what PHMSA is thinking relative to changes to regulation resulting from those audits? Industry is curious as to what impact there will be on planned/draft revisions to RP 1162.

--- End ---

## Comm Team Meeting Participants

Participated	Name	Represents	Company	Email
Y	Cynthia Munyon*	NAPSR	Iowa Utilities Board	<a href="mailto:cynthia.munyon@iub.iowa.gov">cynthia.munyon@iub.iowa.gov</a>
Y	Julie Halliday*	PHMSA	PHMSA	<a href="mailto:Julie.Halliday@dot.gov">Julie.Halliday@dot.gov</a>
Y	Andrew Kohout	FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	<a href="mailto:andrew.kohout@ferc.gov">andrew.kohout@ferc.gov</a>
	Doug Sipe	FERC	FERC	<a href="mailto:douglas.sipe@ferc.gov">douglas.sipe@ferc.gov</a>
	Jim Philipps	NACo	NACo	<a href="mailto:jphilipps@naco.org">jphilipps@naco.org</a>
	Chuck Lesniak	NLC	City of Austin, TX	<a href="mailto:chuck.lesniak@austintexas.gov">chuck.lesniak@austintexas.gov</a>
	Julia Pulidindi	NLC	National League of Cities	<a href="mailto:pulidindi@nlc.org">pulidindi@nlc.org</a>
	Debbie Bassert	NAHB	National Association of Home Builders	<a href="mailto:dbassert@nahb.org">dbassert@nahb.org</a>
	Claire Worshtil	NAHB	NAHB	<a href="mailto:cworshtil@nahb.org">cworshtil@nahb.org</a>
	Erika Lee	CGA	Common Ground Alliance	<a href="mailto:erikaa@commongroundalliance.com">erikaa@commongroundalliance.com</a>
Y	Rebecca Craven	PST	Pipeline Safety Trust	<a href="mailto:rebecca@pstrust.org">rebecca@pstrust.org</a>
Y	Carl Weimer	PST	Pipeline Safety Trust	<a href="mailto:carl@pstrust.org">carl@pstrust.org</a>
Y	Larry Springer	API	Enbridge Energy Co., Inc.	<a href="mailto:larry.springer@enbridge.com">larry.springer@enbridge.com</a>
	Jim Ryan	INGAA	Williams	<a href="mailto:Jim.ryan@williams.com">Jim.ryan@williams.com</a>
	Andrea Grover	INGAA	Spectra Energy	<a href="mailto:ADGrover@spectraenergy.com">ADGrover@spectraenergy.com</a>
Y	Dwayne Teschendorf	INGAA	Spectra Energy	<a href="mailto:DETeschendorf@spectraenergy.com">DETeschendorf@spectraenergy.com</a>
Y	Susan Waller	INGAA	Spectra Energy	<a href="mailto:SDWaller@spectraenergy.com">SDWaller@spectraenergy.com</a>
Y	Dan Regan	INGAA		
	Phil Bennett	AGA	American Gas Association	<a href="mailto:pbennett@aga.org">pbennett@aga.org</a>
Y	Junaid Faruq	AGA	American Gas Association	<a href="mailto:jfaruq@aga.org">jfaruq@aga.org</a>
Y	Perry Cloyd	AGA	Vectren	<a href="mailto:pcloyd@vectren.com">pcloyd@vectren.com</a>
	Chuck Kanoy	AGA	Vectren	<a href="mailto:bckanoy@vectren.com">bckanoy@vectren.com</a>
	Lydia Meigs	AGA	AGA	<a href="mailto:lmeigs@aga.org">lmeigs@aga.org</a>
Y	Anna Osland	Academia		<a href="mailto:oslanda@gmail.com">oslanda@gmail.com</a>
Y	Van McClendon	Public, Local Government	Pulaski County, AR, Planning & Development	
Y	Herb Wilhite	Cycla	Cycla Corporation	<a href="mailto:herbw@cycla.com">herbw@cycla.com</a>
	* Co-Leaders			

**Meeting Agenda/Slides:**

U.S. Department of Transportation  
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials  
Safety Administration

## CPD Questions

Q: Who typically regulates and approves the design of the tank sites?	Q: Do we need to be requiring that rights-of-way for pipelines be larger to accommodate safety needs, maintenance needs, emergency response needs?
Q: This isn't a question, but a suggestion, perhaps reach out to the Urban Land Institute (ULI). They're one of the key organizations that developers work with as well as designers. By the way, this is an EXCELLENT presentation!! Too often planners hide under a rock of propaganda and aren't informed about O&G. The relationship to land use really needs to be shared more often. Great job!	Q: How many incidents per year? Q: Is there a team similar to FAA that reviews incidents? Is there a technical team to assist in emergency response? Is the odor added to natural gas lines at the production lines? Q: Are there recommended practices for local transmission pipe lines.
Q: In Oregon pipelines in the Coastal Zone need to be approved by local land use authorities, and the LNG permitting process has been contentious statewide with very active grass-roots organizations. Do operators have a history of attempting to avoid local land use control by approaching federal regulators, e.g. FERC directly?	Q: Are there any requirements for designing facilities in context with their surroundings such as in rural areas constructing structures that look like farm buildings? Q: Are steps being taken to make the pipeline system more secure? Either nationally or locally
Q: How many miles, or what percentage of pipelines are located on private property (e.g., under existing developments) as opposed to within rights-of-way where the impacts of an explosion would be less?	Q: Are there any examples of homes being devalued because of being located close to pipelines? Are realtors required to notify buyers that a pipeline is adjacent to the property ?  Q: Ahem, Usage Police here: Primers with a hard I are undercoating prep compounds for paint...primers, basic handbooks or manuals are pronounced with a soft I...rhymes with trimmer, dimmer. If you're going to use the word, please use it properly. :)

U.S. Department of Transportation  
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials  
Safety Administration

## CPD Survey Comments

Visual material was excellent	It was a good webcast. Useful information for those who deal with pipelines like my county.
Very relevant topic that pertains to most places...	It is amazing that planners don't know this already!
Very informative!	Interesting and important topic. Thanks for sharing.
very informative session and knowledgeable speakers.	I found the session very useful.
Very eye opening. I've already mapped the gas lines in my City (Portland, Maine) and intend to check our local ordinances / and refer staff at our fiscal planning office to this webinar.	Great presentation.
Very detailed with good internet resources for me to use later.	Good use of visuals with the technical information
This was an excellent session on land use and development planning near transmission pipelines. I plan on using the NFMS system website for my work and it will be very useful information for my work. I was not aware that this mapping system and the federal agency that provides it existed previously. This program also provided important information for planning professionals and for communities on pipelines, not only for planning, but for hazard mitigation, but for also for property owner practices.	Good Topic Great Information More information on how to access copies of the presentation would be helpful.
This was a very good session & emphasizes the need for government planning to obtain accurate survey's during the initial development consideration to ensure proper & safe land planning.	Good to learn about the hazards associated with gas transmission. The natural gas lobby spends so much time and \$ stating how safe and environmentally friendly it is; truth is there are hidden dangers that are being adequately disclosed.
The speakers were well chosen and informative, and comprehensively covered a very complex topic.	Good overview and provision of information sources
The first half hour or so was too involved with pipeline background information. Although somewhat helpful for background information, this portion should have been much shorter given the title of the session.	Excellent topic
One of the best webinars I've ever attended!! Such great, timely information. Important for APA to educate planners on the REALITIES of the O&G industry, its history as a utility in this country, and how to live with it without going to eradication unnecessarily. Well done!	Both speakers sounded as if they were reading from a prepared text. Also, I think there should have been more emphasis on the planning aspect. Perhaps an additional speaker who had prepared a plan or elements of a plan dealing with pipeline issues.
leave contact info up longer	always too much emphasis on paper and detail and not enough on the big picture issues



- Who is planning on attending the PA Workshop in Dallas June 19-20?
- Date/location for annual planning meeting (July 9-10 in DC?)
  - Agenda topics?
  - Thoughts on speakers?
  - Other stakeholder outreach approaches?
- Review: Why use hazard mitigation planning approach for reach state/local governments?



## Challenges to Implementation of PIPA RPs

- Planners did not recognize pipelines as a potential hazard
- Pipelines are not a priority until:
  - accident occurs
  - new pipeline proposed
- Low level of pipeline and PIPA awareness
- Finding “champions” within 89,000+ local governments
- Integrating hazard mitigation planning into routine planning
- Timing of message...historic low-level of new construction
- Limited resources
- Few relationships with planners

## Communication Plan Guiding Principles

- Target local government stakeholder
- Use stakeholder terminology
- Utilize existing, authoritative, trusted local government channels
- Institutionalize consideration of pipelines in planning
- Recognizes risk is local
- Foster effective stakeholder relationships

## Pipeline Safety Bonus!!!

The HMP process supports promotion of other pipeline safety actions for which local government stakeholders have authority/role.

- Public awareness of pipelines
- Excavation damage prevention
- Emergency Response Preparedness

# THIRA = Funding for Pipeline Emergencies Training

## Who is required to complete a THIRA?

The THIRA requirement, as it applies to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) preparedness grants, is that the following entities must complete a THIRA by December 31, 2012 as a condition of their FY 2012 grant funding:

- All 56 State Administrative Agencies (SAAs) receiving funding under the FY 2012 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) and the Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) program; and
- All 31 Urban Areas receiving funding under the FY 2012 Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) grant program.



## Washtenaw County, MI

### 3.3 Hazard Analysis – Technological Hazards

agricultural sector) and can result in reduced water supplies for farms and local businesses. Water conservation measures may be implemented, but only on the authority of the local government.

There is no record of Washtenaw County seeking aid for the agricultural community due to drought conditions, nor is there a record of severe drought conditions. The type of hazard is more a concern for the western United States and, when drought conditions occur in any part of the United States, Federal aid is available to all farmers, regardless of geographic location. With regard to water resources, much of Washtenaw County's water supply comes from the Detroit River through WCAU (Washtenaw County Utilities Authority). A drought that impacts our water supplies would certainly be devastating to Washtenaw County, as well as the southeast region.

**Mitigation Strategies** The following mitigation strategies for drought are included in one or more local government plans:

- Work to secure water supply.
- Encourage water rationing when necessary, and
- Educate the public on ways to conserve water.

**Hazard Assessment** Given the low frequency of past occurrences and the likelihood of future occurrences, this hazard received a lower ranking than other hazards.

**7. Earthquakes** County Ranking: **210**  
**Description:** Earthquakes are a sudden movement in the earth's surface as a result of an energy release from the earth's crust. There are two potential sources of earthquake activity for Washtenaw County. The Grenville Front is a regional fault zone and crosses under the County from the southeast to northeast. The Grenville Front is dormant and is considered a lower concern. The New Madrid Fault, located from Cairo, Illinois through New Madrid, Missouri to Market Town, Arkansas, is predicted to have a strong to major earthquake – between 6.0 and 7.0 – in the next few decades. This event could impact the County at an intensity level of 6. This hazard could easily impact natural gas and petroleum pipelines as well as water supply mains, which is a major concern.

**Hazard Assessment:** Washtenaw County communities should be prepared for an earthquake. However given the frequency of such an event, earthquakes were given a lower ranking in comparison to hazards that could impact the entire County population, and are likely to occur more frequently.

**Mitigation Strategies** Mitigation strategies for earthquakes that are proposed by one or more local governments include:

- Emergency preparedness
- Public education, and
- Enforcing enforcement of building code standards.

**8. Subsidence** County Ranking: **N/A**  
**Description:** Subsidence is the lowering or collapsing of land surface caused by natural or human-induced activities that erode or remove subsurface support (MSPEMID). One major cause of subsidence is mining. The coal basin in Michigan (and adjacent to the northeast corner of Washtenaw County). The only recently reported subsidence incident occurred in 1999 in Milan City (Monroe County), and is attributed to a loading plane over US-23 reportedly sank eight inches over a 30-foot stretch of highway, causing traffic delays for several miles, lasting approximately 10 hours.

**Hazard Assessment:** Given the lack of mining in Washtenaw County and the sparse history of subsidence occurrences impacting people, property and natural resources, this hazard is not ranked.

**15. Petroleum and Natural Gas Pipeline Accidents** County Ranking: **210**  
**Description:** Pipeline accidents are an uncontrolled release of petroleum, natural gas, or the poisonous by-product of hydrogen sulfide, from a pipeline (MSPEMID). There are several major gas pipelines and petroleum lines running through Washtenaw County.

There are no reported incidents of pipeline accidents occurring within the County. Contiguous counties – Jackson, Livingston, Oakland and Wayne – have experienced one or more significant events within the past five years. The worst of these happened in Jackson County, in 2000, when a gas pipeline rupture released 75,000 gallons of gas, and caused the evacuation of 500 homes within a mile radius for five days, caused a drop in pressure felt as far as Joliet, Illinois, as well as significant damage to the environment.

There are several entities involved in the regulation of pipelines:

- Michigan Public Service Commission performs safety inspections.
- Protection of Underground Utilities Act (Miss Dig), and
- The "Pipeline Group", as a consortium of pipeline companies, exists for the sole purpose of updating emergency information for first responders.

Despite Washtenaw County's record, the potential for loss of life, property and natural resources, and the potential response and recovery costs are significant.

**Mitigation Strategies** The following mitigation strategies for pipeline accidents are included in one or more local government plans:

- Continued training for first responders, HazMat team,
- Enforcement of buffer distances to protect population for impacts, and
- Public Education (Disseminate Emergency Preparedness Information).

**Hazard Assessment:** Of the 90 investigations of incidents performed by the Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSIC) since 1990, at least 50% have resulted in injuries, death or significant property damage. In addition, these types of incidents are increasing due to the increasing size of the population and the prevalence of construction activities (MSPEMID). This hazard therefore received an intermediate ranking given the frequency of past occurrences, but also taking into consideration the likelihood of future occurrences.

**Pipeline – Critical Infrastructure to be Protected**

**Pipeline – Hazard to be Evaluated**



# Hazard Mitigation Primer Discussion

Pipelines and Hazard Mitigation for Emergency Management Draft 04/10/2019

Table of Contents	
Table of Contents	1
Foreword	1
Administrative	4
Introduction: An Overview of Pipelines	4
Regulatory Framework for Hazard Mitigation Plans	20
Appendix A - Pipeline System	40
Appendix B - Physical and Chemical Properties of Pipeline Products	70
Appendix C - Pipeline Design and Construction	81
Appendix D - Pipeline Operations and Safety Programs	90
Appendix E - Case Studies: Pipeline Technology and Asset Ground Storage Tanks	100
Appendix G - Other Federal Agencies	124

**Foreword**

PTFA Recommended Practices and Hazard Mitigation Plans following an October 19th [Pipeline and Offshore Platform Integrity \(POPI\) Report](#) focusing on better defining pipeline safety in communities through risk-informed local planning.

**Final Report of Recommended Practices**, in November 2017, a representative team of representative stakeholder organizations bring communities plan for other hazards and beyond an the hazard mitigation planning process.

Mitigation is commonly defined as sustained activities to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to people and property from hazards and their effects. Hazard mitigation involves both structural measures, such as levees, and infrastructure from the design, close focus of potential hazards, with the addition of sound technical advice to the creation of public works.

\*Revised and shortened by PTFA, April 10, 2019. <http://www.pipfa.org/2019/04/10/2019-04-10-01/>

Hazard Mitigation Planning for Pipeline Operators PTFA 2019

Table of Contents	
Table of Contents	2
Foreword	4
PTFA Recommended Practices and Hazard Mitigation Plans	4
Foreword	2
Background: Why Hazard Mitigation Matters and Hazard Mitigation Plans	4
Hazard Mitigation Planning	4
Inclusion of Materials and Technological Hazards	7
Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA)	7
Integrating Pipeline Risk-based Mitigation Plans	8
Partners	8
Regulatory Framework for Hazard Mitigation	9
Hazard Mitigation Planning for Pipelines - Voluntary Assessment	12
Consequences, Pipeline Safety and Incident Response	14
Behavioral Perspective on Pipeline Risk	14
State or Local Perspective on Pipeline Consequences	15
Ready to Engage Planning for Pipelines - Capacity Assessments	18
Practice Hazard Mitigation Examples	22
Be on the alert for updates and changes to this document in the hazard mitigation plans.	22

**Foreword**

PTFA Recommended Practices and Hazard Mitigation Plans following the [Pipeline and Offshore Platform Integrity \(POPI\) Report](#), October 19th, 2017, a team of representative stakeholder organizations through risk-informed local planning process, in November 2017, a team of representative stakeholder organizations bring communities plan for other hazards and beyond of the hazard mitigation planning process.

\*Revised and shortened by PTFA, April 10, 2019. <http://www.pipfa.org/2019/04/10/2019-04-10-01/>

## Questions for FEMA

- How to categorize pipeline hazard - technological or manmade or human caused hazard?
- Ideas from their experience with engaging/educating stakeholders in the hazard mitigation process.
- Confirm THIRA = Pipeline Emergencies training funding